

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 33-64 are pending in the application. Claims 33 and 42 are amended herein. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim 33 has been amended to delete the word "means" in order to avoid interpretation of claim 33 under 35 USC 112, paragraph six. Claim 42 has been amended to include the missing term "comprising." Neither of these amendments has been made to overcome any prior-art rejections.

### Drawings

In paragraph 1 of the office action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, suggesting that Figure 1 should be labeled as "Prior Art." The Applicant submits that Figure 1 is not prior art. As such, the Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

### Specification

In paragraph 3, the Examiner required an abstract on a separate sheet. In response, the Applicant provides an Abstract on a separate sheet at the end of this amendment.

In paragraph 4a, the Examiner objected to the disclosure for omitting appropriate section headings. In response, the Applicant has amended the specification to add appropriate section headings.

In paragraph 4b, the Examiner suggest that the Applicant spell out the first instance of the acronym "CW." In response, the Applicant has amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

In paragraph 4c, the Examiner suggested that the Applicant re-write the figure references on page 3 for Figures 4, 6-7, and 9. In response, the Applicant has amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

### Claim Objections

In paragraph 6, the Examiner objected to claim 48, suggesting that the claim be double-spaced. The Applicant is not aware of any such requirement. Nevertheless, the Applicant has complied with the Examiner's request.

### Prior-Art Rejections

In paragraph 8, the Examiner rejected claims 33-36, 44, 51-52, 57-59, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1)." In paragraph 10, the Examiner rejected claims 37, 45, 56, and 64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1)" in view of McNicol. In paragraph 11, the Examiner rejected claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1)" in view of Kenington. In paragraph 12, the Examiner rejected claims 46, 53, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1)" in view of McNicol and further in view of Faulkner. In paragraph 13, the Examiner rejected claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Fig. 1)" in view of Voyce. In paragraph 14, the Examiner objected to claims 38-42, 47-50, 60-61, and 63 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner rejected claim 33 as being anticipated by Fig. 1 of the present application, which the Examiner characterized as being part of "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art." The Applicant submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized Applicant's admitted prior art. In particular, Fig. 1 is not part of Applicant's admitted prior art. The discussion of Fig. 1 appears under the section heading "DETAILED DESCRIPTION," not under the section heading "BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION." The present application contains no admission that Fig. 1 is prior art. On the contrary, the Applicant explicitly submits that Fig. 1 is not prior art.

The other cited references do not teach the features of claim 33 that are missing from the Applicant's actual admitted prior art.

As such, the Applicant submits that claim 33 is allowable over Applicant's actual admitted prior art and the other cited references. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 57 is allowable over the Applicant's actual admitted prior art and the other cited references. Since the rest of the claims depend variously from claims 33 and 57, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Applicant's actual admitted prior art and the other cited references. The Applicant submits therefore that the rejections of claims under Sections 102(b) and 103(a) have been overcome.

#### Missing Reference Citation

On page 14, the Examiner referred to U.S. Patent No. 4,580,105 (Myer), but this reference does not appear to be cited in any PTO 1449 or 892 forms in this case. As such, the Applicant submits herewith an IDS citing this reference. The Applicant requests official confirmation by the Examiner that this reference has been considered.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Mendelsohn  
Registration No. 35,951  
Attorney for Applicant  
(215) 557-6657 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)

Date: 11/12/06

Customer No. 22186

Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.  
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102